

IN THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method of processing a document, said method comprising:
 - converting a document into a common format document;
 - recognizing a concept in said common format document, wherein said concept represents a basic idea expressed in said common format document;
 - incorporating said concept in a conceptual model; and
 - using said conceptual model to determine whether said document is responsive to a search query;

wherein the concept in the conceptual model is associated with a hierarchical conceptual taxonomy specifying at least one relationship between two or more concepts.
2. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein recognizing said concept includes:
 - identifying a plurality of features in said common format document, wherein said plurality of features represents evidence of said concept in said common format document.
3. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 2, wherein recognizing said concept further includes:
 - calculating a concept weight for said concept using a plurality of feature weights associated with said plurality of features, wherein said concept weight represents a recognition confidence level for said concept; and
 - comparing said concept weight with a predetermined threshold value.
4. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising:
 - by referencing said conceptual model, generating an auto-attribute, said auto-attribute being a descriptive label for said common format document.

5. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 1, further comprising:
by referencing said conceptual model, assigning said common format document to a subject category.
6. (Original) The computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein said converting includes converting said document into a common format document that is in an XML format.
7. (Currently Amended) A computer-readable medium to direct a computer to function in a specified manner, comprising:
instructions to recognize a basic idea expressed in a document;
instructions to assign a concept identification to said basic idea;
instructions to generate a conceptual model based upon said concept identification; and
instructions to use said conceptual model to determine whether said document is responsive to a search query;
wherein the concept identification used to generate the conceptual model is associated with a hierarchical conceptual taxonomy specifying at least one relationship between two or more concepts.
8. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 7, wherein said instructions to recognize said basic idea include:
instructions to determine whether a plurality of features is present in said document, wherein said plurality of features represents evidence that said basic idea is expressed in said document.
9. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 8, wherein said instructions to recognize said basic idea further include:
instructions to calculate a recognition confidence level for said basic idea using a plurality of feature weights associated with said plurality of features; and
instructions to compare said recognition confidence level with a predetermined threshold value.

10. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 9, wherein said instructions to generate said conceptual model include:

instructions to incorporate said recognition confidence level in said conceptual model.

11. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 7, further comprising:

instructions to assign an auto-attribute to said document based upon said conceptual model, wherein said auto-attribute represents a descriptive label for said document.

12. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 7, further comprising:

instructions to place said document in a category of a categorization taxonomy based upon said conceptual model, wherein said categorization taxonomy includes a plurality of categories.

13. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 12, wherein said instructions to place said document in said category include:

instructions to assign an auto-category to said document, wherein said auto-category represents a descriptive label for said category.

14. (Currently Amended) A computer, comprising:

a processor; and

a memory connected to said processor, wherein said memory includes:

a document modeling module, said document modeling module having:

a first module configured to direct said processor to recognize a concept in a document, wherein said concept represents a basic idea expressed in said document; and

a second module configured to direct said processor to generate a conceptual model based upon said concept;

wherein said conceptual model is used to determine whether said document is responsive to a search query, and the concept used to generate the conceptual model is associated with a hierarchical conceptual taxonomy specifying at least one relationship between two or more concepts.

15. (Previously Presented) The computer of claim 14, wherein said memory further includes:
a document integration module, said document integration module having:
a third module configured to direct said processor to convert said document to a common format.

16. (Previously Presented) The computer of claim 15, wherein said document integration module further has:

a fourth module configured to direct said processor to separate a text portion from said document; and

a fifth module configured to direct said processor to incorporate said text portion in said document in the common format.

17. (Original) The computer of claim 14, wherein said first module has:

a sixth module configured to direct said processor to determine whether a plurality of features is present in said document, wherein said plurality of features represents evidence of said concept in said document;

a seventh module configured to direct said processor to calculate a concept weight for said concept using a plurality of feature weights associated with said plurality of features, wherein said concept weight represents a recognition confidence level for said concept; and

an eighth module configured to direct said processor to compare said concept weight with a predetermined threshold value.

18. (Original) The computer of claim 14, wherein said memory further includes:

a modeling directory,

and wherein said document modeling module further has:

a ninth module configured to direct said processor to store said conceptual model in said modeling directory.

19. (Original) The computer of claim 14, wherein said document modeling module further has:

a tenth module configured to direct said processor to generate an auto-attribute based upon said conceptual model, wherein said auto-attribute represents a descriptive label for said

document.

20. (Original) The computer of claim 14, wherein said document modeling module further has:
an eleventh module configured to direct said processor to categorize said
document in a category of a plurality of categories based upon said conceptual model.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37 CFR §1.133 AND MPEP §713.04

A telephonic interview in the above-referenced case was conducted on January 10, 2006 between the Examiner and the Applicants' undersigned representative. The Office Action mailed on October 20, 2005 was discussed. Specifically, the rejections of claim 1 in light of Russell-Falla (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,162) and the proposed amendments set forth herein were discussed with the intent to place the claims in better condition for allowance or appeal.

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the interview.